

### Remarks

Claims 1-9 are currently pending in the Application and Claim 10 is newly presented herein.

### New Claim

This response adds new Claim 10 to more completely claim the invention. Support for the new Claim 10 can be found, for example, paragraphs [0008], [0045]-[0050] and [0070]-[0079] of the specification as published.

### 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hendrick (U.S. Publ. No. 2003/0060157) and further in view of Headings (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,469). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

*Applicant submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because the Examiner has failed to show that Hendrick and Headings teach each and every element as claimed in the present application.*

### Claim 1

A. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Hendrick and Headings disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

“a **right holder's side apparatus** which is connected to the information providing apparatus via the network, the right holder's side having a right of information provided by the information providing apparatus” (emphasis added)

Applicant submits that in rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner failed to show where Hendrick or Headings disclose a “right holder's side apparatus” as recited in Claim 1 (p.2-4 of the Office Action). If the Examiner believes that a “right holder's side apparatus” as recited

in Claim 1 is disclosed in Hendrick or Headings, the Examiner is requested to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) and “designate as nearly as practicable” where Hendrick or Headings disclose a “right holder's side apparatus which is connected to the information providing apparatus via the network, the right holder's side having a right of information provided by the information providing apparatus” as recited in Claim 1. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn and Claim 1 be allowed.

**B.** Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Hendrick and Headings disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

“an identification information receiving device which receives via the network the identification information transmitted from the information reproducing apparatus; a related information acquiring device which **acquires the related information based on the received identification information**; a related information providing device which provides the related information via the network to the information reproducing apparatus” (emphasis added)

Applicant submits that in rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner failed to show where Hendrick or Headings disclose that the “related information” is acquired “based on the received identification information” that is **transmitted from** the “information reproducing apparatus” and **received by** the “identification information receiving device” as recited in Claim 1.

If the Examiner does not agree, the Examiner is requested to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) and “designate as nearly as practicable” where Hendrick or Headings disclose that the “related information” is acquired “based on the received identification information” that is **transmitted from** the “information reproducing apparatus” and **received by** the “identification information receiving device” as recited in Claim 1. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn and Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-6 and 10

Claims 2-6 and 10, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also patentable over Hendrick and Headings.

Claim 7

**A.** Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hendrick and Headings do not teach, disclose or suggest “a **right holder's side apparatus** which is connected to the information providing apparatus via the network, the right holder's side having a right of information provided by the information providing apparatus” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 7. Hence Claim 7 is patentable over Hendrick and Headings and should be allowed by the Examiner.

**B.** Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hendrick and Headings do not teach, disclose or suggest “an identification information receiving device which receives via the network the identification information transmitted from the information reproducing apparatus; a related information acquiring device which **acquires the related information based on the received identification information**” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 7. Hence Claim 7 is patentable over Hendrick and Headings and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Claim 8

**A.** Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hendrick and Headings do not teach, disclose or suggest “a **right holder's side apparatus** which is connected to the information providing apparatus via the network, the right holder's side having a right of information provided by the information providing apparatus” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 8. Hence Claim 8 is patentable over Hendrick and Headings and should be allowed by the Examiner.

**B.** Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hendrick and Headings do not teach, disclose or suggest “receiving via the network the identification information transmitted from the information reproducing apparatus; **acquiring the**

**related information based on the received identification information**” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 8. Hence Claim 8 is patentable over Hendrick and Headings and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Claim 9

**A.** Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hendrick and Headings do not teach, disclose or suggest “a **right holder's side apparatus** which is connected to the information providing apparatus via the network, the right holder's side having a right of information provided by the information providing apparatus” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 9. Hence Claim 9 is patentable over Hendrick and Headings and should be allowed by the Examiner.

**B.** Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hendrick and Headings do not teach, disclose or suggest “receiving via the network the identification information transmitted from the information reproducing apparatus; **acquiring the related information based on the received identification information**” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 9. Hence Claim 9 is patentable over Hendrick and Headings and should be allowed by the Examiner.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415/08-2025(HP). In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415/08-2025(HP).

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via electronic filing.

Date of Transmission: September 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Alexander Krayner 60,854/  
Alexander Krayner  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 60,854  
LADAS & PARRY LLP  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300